



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

The last few years have been marked by the passing of so many noteworthy personalities from the world of philological activity that the Journal might readily be turned into a Campo Santo. But in the unending procession, 'der eine fällt, die andern rücken nach'; and sometimes the sense of loss makes itself felt more acutely after the lapse of time. With the recent accessions to Homeric literature, with such a monumental work as SEYMOUR'S *Life in the Homeric Age* before me, it is natural that my thoughts should turn to the great representative of Homeric study in England, DAVID BINNING MONRO, to whose memory I am bound by ties of personal gratitude. I was the guest of the late Provost of Oriel a few weeks before his lamented death. He was a stricken man even then, as every eye could see, but no one thought that the end was so near, so bravely did he bear himself among the social exactions of the Encaenia. His demeanor in these trying circumstances was of a piece with his life as revealed by the sketch written some time ago for the *Biographisches Jahrbuch* of the *Jahresbericht* by his friend COOK WILSON, and now reproduced in an English translation by the author (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press) with some slight modifications and a likeness of MONRO after the portrait by the distinguished painter Orchardson. The sketch, slight as it is, conveys a lesson that the showinesses and obtrusivenesses of our day and coming days may well take to heart. MONRO did not give himself freely. So much more precious were his words of approval—*μέγα τοι φέρεται πὰρ σέθεν*—and I cherish the memory of his gracious acts and his kind recognition. Such a man had to be divined and was worth divining and this memoir of COOK WILSON'S gives the answer to the guesses of those that were without his circle and puts the man and the scholar, with his quiet influence and his wonderful activity, in the right light. The versatility of his talent and the variety of his attainments, as set forth in this brief summary, are astonishing and yet I doubt whether all has been told. Left alone for half an hour in his library, not his study, I was struck by the wide range of interest manifested in the selection of the books, not surprising perhaps in a frivolous mortal of the *feuilletoniste* order but delightful in an austere scholar, whose studies lay in such regions as Homeric Grammar and Greek Music. Here the judge was off the bench, and one always thinks of Monro as a judge. His friend and fellow-worker, T. W. ALLEN, himself an eminent scholar, says of him: 'His judgement was unapproached. The motives of like and dislike

were far from him, and from his verdict there is seldom an appeal. Few can have had dealings with him, personal or literary, without feeling that *πρότερος γέγονει καὶ πλείονα ἤδη.*

From a large mass of material Lady JEBB has selected for publication a number of her husband's *Essays and Addresses* (Cambridge University Press) and has thereby made not only classical scholars her debtors but also those who are interested in the cause of education and especially in the maintenance of Latin and Greek as indispensable elements of the highest culture. It is not the province of this Journal to deal with educational questions. For those who read these pages such questions are settled, and it need only be said here that the advocates of classical training cannot replenish their armory with weapons offensive and defensive of finer temper and greater brilliancy than those which are stored in the essays on *Humanism in Education* and the *Influence of the Greek Mind on Modern Life*. Among the papers that concern the professed Grecian directly may be mentioned the *Genius of Sophocles*, *Suidas on the Change ascribed to Sophocles in regard to Trilogies*, and above all *The Speeches of Thucydides*, a treatise of abiding value, as every student of the historian knows, and the famous essay on *Pindar*, which touches me so nearly that the indulgent reader of *Brief Mention*, although perhaps a little weary of my frequent recurrence to that lonely poet, will forgive me for falling into the reminiscential vein.

My Pindar is the only book I ever made as a labor of love: and though I recognized the fact that others knew Pindar better than I could ever hope to know him, and though my philological training bade me study all the great interpreters, still I dared to face what seemed to me the vital problems independently. Comparison came only after an honest effort to understand the mind of the poet for myself. It is not strange then that Jebb's essay, which appeared in 1882 at a time when I was gathering myself up for my work, disquieted me sorely. Here was a study by an accomplished Hellenist, in whose earliest performances I had recognized the hand of a master, a man of admirable poise, of wonderful insight, of flawless style, a scholar whose renderings made all others seem coarse or crude. If Pindar was to be glorified, he was the man to do it and not I, and if he had edited Pindar, I should have abandoned a work, of which I had been dreaming years before 'the famous freshman' left Charterhouse. So I put the essay aside with 'rueful admiration' (A. J. P. XXVII 481), lest reading it too closely I should copy it too closely and spoil it in the copying. Perhaps if I had learned of Jebb, it would have not been said of my Pindar that I was not in sympathy with the poet, that my book was not a Pindaric book (A. J. P. XXVI 115). But in the course of time that stricture has lost

whatever stringency it had, for, as I have set forth elsewhere, recent critics have been so cruel in their judgments of Pindar that nowadays to call a book a 'Pindaric book' would scarcely be a compliment. Indeed, it would be hard to say what is Pindaric to some people. I have read of late that Méry once quoted Pindar as saying, 'L'or est un rayon de soleil solidifié', and when one of his hearers questioned the accuracy of the master's quotation, his reply was: 'S'il ne l'a pas dit, il aurait dû le dire'. And not a few translations are constructed on that principle. But Jebb's translations have for a generation been the exemplar of all scholars born to the English tongue and if a doubt arises, one must marshal all one's mining apparatus to dislodge the fair structure, the *χρυσέας κίονας* he has reared. Now after all these years, I can study his essay and his renderings in the right spirit of detachment and wonder why I did not use more freely the means of illuminating my poet. And if commenting on translations were not as endless a task as commenting on conjectural emendations, I might take up many pages of *Brief Mention* in unfolding the peculiar felicities of Jebb's versions, felicities that are not all evident to those who are not special students of Pindar; but I can make room for only one little specimen of the thoughts that arise in me as I turn over the pages of the essay on Pindar.

In my commentary on the Fourth Olympian I made v. 18 the keynote of the poem, and translated *διάπειρά τοι βοτῶν ἔλεγχος*, 'The final trial is the test of mortals'. The poem, it will be remembered, records the late success of a man who had reached middle age before he made his mark as a contestant for Olympic honors. At least such is the natural inference from the poetic parallel with the Argonaut Erginos and, while I refused to make the parallel between Psaumis and Erginos too close, I was all the time half-consciously making another parallel between another middle-aged man and the victor. The circumstances of my life, notably the upsetting of all my plans of authorship by the Civil War, and its dire sequel Reconstruction had kept me in the background until I had passed the age when some of my contemporaries had won wide recognition and authoritative rank. And so I seem now to detect a personal note in my analysis of the Fourth Olympian.

The final test is the true test. Success may be slow in coming, but when it comes, it reveals the man. The thunder chariot of Zeus is an unwearied chariot. What, though the Horai revolve and revolve ere they bring the witness of the lofty contest? Good fortune dawns and then comes gratulation forthwith.

'The light comes late' I wrote: but there are those who maintain and perhaps rightly that *χρονιώτατον* means 'lasting', not 'late', and that the *δια-* in *διάπειρα* refers not to the final perseverance of the saints in which I was brought up to believe, but to the good old heathen doctrine of the value of rivalry, rivalry which I have

always detested, being at least in this particular in thorough sympathy with St. James. According to this view *δια-* here is not the *δια-* of 'decision', but the *certainly* *δια-*; the *δια-* we have in *διάδω*, *διαθέω* and the whole list which Dr. Holden has been at the pains of collecting in his note on Xen. *Cyrop.* I 4, 4. Still it is hard for me even now to surrender my interpretation; but I grant that under the circumstances my testimony is suspect and Jebb is in all likelihood a better guide than the ill-balanced student who allowed his petty fortunes to sway his interpretation. 'Jebb was ever a fighter', we are told, and took delight in the contest for supremacy. Indeed nothing comes out more plainly from his *Life and Letters* which the world of scholars owes to the devotion of Lady JEBB (Cambridge University Press). No wonder that he rendered the line in true Pindaric spirit (*Essays and Addresses*, p. 58): 'Trial against their fellows is the test of men', for he had stood every such test triumphantly and might have said with Pindar: πολλοῖσι δ' ἀγῆμαι σοφίας ἑτέροις. Prizeman of Charterhouse, Porson Scholar, Craven Scholar, Senior Classic, Fellow of Trinity, Professor of Greek at Glasgow, Regius Professor (to be) at Cambridge — everything he tried for he gained. 'Cambridge had been his home for seventeen years. He loved every stone in Trinity; the Senate House spoke to him, as he passed, of contests waged and victories won'. He knew the mind of Pindar, he knew the true meaning of *διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος*.

Further practical illustration of the importance of the personal equation, drawn from the dissidence between Jebb's view and mine touching Pindar's Panhellenism, might be considered presumptuous (Intro. *Ess.* xi), but there will be no dispute as to the importance and fascination of the study. The difference due to nationality is more obvious (*A. J. P.* XXVII 357) and in his essay on Samuel Johnson, Jebb himself calls attention to the fact that 'an eminent French writer, who has shown a power unusual in his countrymen, of comprehending England — Monsieur Taine — is obliged to confess that he cannot understand the English love of Johnson'; but the comparison of Jebb's *Primer of Greek Literature*, which one can readily believe with Lady JEBB 'cost him more trouble than all his other books put together', and Wilamowitz's sketch in the 'Kultur der Gegenwart' would yield interesting results to the psychologist as well as to the student of national character. And it is this personal element that Lady JEBB's memoir enables us to take more fully into account and so to understand better the great interpreter of Sophokles, who, like his poet, does not yield the secret of his art at once. It is Lady JEBB's memoir that has supplied in a measure the peculiar glint of the eye that revealed the thought of the living man, what Dr. VERRALL calls 'the side glance of the eyes, demure and humorous'; and the insight thus gained is worth many pages of the kind of exegesis to which Jebb himself has been

exposed since death has made him a classic. But technical scholarship has its rights and Lady JEBB has left the characterization of her husband as scholar and critic to a scholar of high rank, to a critic of great acumen. How well fitted for his arduous task Dr. VERRALL is, may be gathered from the enthusiasm he rouses in his pupils. In the poems of that 'crabbed coxcomb' Persius there are no lines that appeal to an old teacher like those that set forth the obligations of the youthful Stoic to Cornutus; and I find in the Preface to Mr. CORNFORD'S *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, which disturbed the peace of my long holiday (A. J. P. XXVIII 356), a tribute to Dr. VERRALL, which I have great pleasure in reproducing here. 'From his books and lectures many of my generation first learned that the Greeks were not blind children, with a singular turn for the commonplace, crying for the light of Christian revelation; and I am conscious, moreover, that in this present attempt to understand not the syntax, but the mind, of Thucydides, I am following, part of the way, a path which first opened before me when in the breathless silence of his lecture-room, I began to understand how literary art could be the passion of a life.' Surely, there could be no better exponent of Jebb than one, whose life is dominated by the passion of literary art. And yet with all his resources of expression Dr. VERRALL pronounces 'the task not merely difficult but truly impossible'. But for all that, he complies with the request 'without hesitation, in the confidence that every reader, in proportion to his own capacity, will be quick to perceive the difficulty and to make the necessary allowance'. 'In proportion to his own capacity' is a characteristic stroke and brings up to every mind Dr. VERRALL'S attitude towards all who approach his own contributions to classical study, which have won so much admiration for their brilliancy from the scholars of our day and carried with them so little abiding conviction.

According to Dr. VERRALL 'sensibility, subtlety, delicacy, economy, reserve were the essential qualities of Jebb's mind and the foundation of his skill in expression', and these essential qualities, which every one will accept, the scholar and the critic, writing of the scholar and the critic, proceeds to illustrate by a study of Jebb's Philoctetes and Trachiniae, with some comments on the Bacchylides. The *Essay on Pindar* and that on *The Speeches of Thucydides* he puts next, as well he may, to the two great editions. I have not space to give specimens of VERRALL'S analysis. Suffice it to say that VERRALL'S study of Jebb itself deserves close study, for there are few better fitted to understand the master; and it has a further interest, of which the author never thought, in that it reveals the difference between the subtlety that insinuates and seduces and the supersubtlety that irritates and repels. But Dr. VERRALL himself would be the first to say that what is subtlety, what supersubtlety, must be judged by

the capacity of the reader; for he is not the one to quote: Habent sua fata libelli, without the prefix: Pro captu lectoris, lacking which we might as well accept for the famous saying the German schoolboy's translation: Es haben ein Schweineglück die Wasserjungfern.

Highly characteristic is Dr. VERRALL'S ready acceptance of one of the few dangerous doctrines to be found in Jebb, the right to fall back on the original signification of the word. 'Most Indo-European nouns', says Jebb (Essay on Pindar, p. 84), expressed some one obvious and characteristic quality of the object which they denoted, e. g. *ναῦς* is "the swimmer", *δρῦς* "the thing which is cleft", etc. Similarly, *ἀκόνη* is the *sharpener*, *κρατήρ* is the *mixer*. A Greek who called a thought an *ἀκόνη* was thus using a less startling image than we should use in calling it a *whetstone*; to call the teacher of a chorus a *κρατήρ* was not the same thing as it would be for us to call him a *bowl*. And such phrases are less audacious in proportion as they are old — i. e. near to the time when the language was still freshly conscious of the primary sense in such words as *ἀκόνη*. It was with distinct reference to this principle that I wrote (Intro. Ess. xli):

Even the most familiar words are roused to new life by the revival of the pristine meaning. It is a canon of Pindaric interpretation that the sharp, local sense of the preposition is everywhere to be preferred, and every substantive may be made to carry its full measure of concreteness. This is distinctly not survival but revival. We are not to suppose that *κρατήρ* (O. 6, 91) was felt by the Greek of Pindar's time as a male agent or *ἀκόνη* (O. 6, 82) as a shrill-voiced woman. Whatever personification lay in the word was dead to the Greek of the time and the *γλυκύς κρατήρ* became a living creature.

After giving his adhesion to the general principle Dr. VERRALL goes on to say: 'Whether this be a sufficient defence for Pindar or no—Jebb does not say so—the principle ought, indeed, as he says to be clearly perceived, and easily may escape notice'. But if Jebb does not apply it to Pindar, what is the relevancy of the examples? Now poetic art was not at its beginnings in Pindar nor for that matter in Homer, and the audacity of the imagery must be charged to the genius of the poet. Within limits the reversion to the primitive meaning is familiar enough in all languages. 'Re-creation' goes back to the original of 'recreation', and Shakespeare's well-worn quibble on 'understand' is an exemplification of the same principle. In Greek, compounds are apt to lose their literal sense, but *συμφέρει*, 'it profits', may be conceived as 'helps to bear', and on O. 9, 87 I have pleaded for *πρόσφορος* = *προσφοράν προσφέρων*, and there are other *-φορος* compounds for which a similar plea might be set up. But the liberty must be guarded and the reserved right exercised as cautiously as the reserved rights of the States in our Union, and if the employment of this resource is to be guarded in exegesis, it is still more carefully to be guarded in conjectural criticism. In one of Dr. VERRALL'S earliest papers

he conjured up an unprovable *τοπάν* in order to get rid of an undesirable *τὸ πᾶν* (O. 2, 93), and having convinced himself of his success in this case he has not hesitated in time of stress to indulge in what I have called 'plastic emendation'. No wonder then that Dr. VERRALL calls special attention 'to the penetrating and characteristic remark'. It is quite in line with his own practice. Most scholars are delighted when they can summon a glossematic word from Hesychios to their help. Dr. VERRALL is his own Hesychios. Indeed, he distinctly claims the right to construct *ἀπαξ εἰρημένα* and does not balk for a moment at such analogical formations as *ἀντῆς*, 'shrieker', Sept. 132, and *μυθοῦσθαι*, Ag. 1367, *οἴτης*, 'shepherd' Ag. 720, *χήρωμα*, Sept. 1013, *συλαίους*, Med. 910, *ἀνωμμάτου* 1184. For *τάσδ' ἐννήν*, 'spin', Cho. 278, he condescends to plead. *ἀνῆλθον*, Cho. 535, he derives from *ἀνάλθω*, and nothing gives him more delight than to elicit new meanings from old groups of letters. So *ἐπ' ἄνδρας*, Sept. 268, becomes *ἐπανδράς*. Doubtless Dr. VERRALL knew as well as any other scholar that *διδράσκω* is a coarse word and occurs only twice in tragedy, once So. Ai. 167: *τὸ σὸν δμῦ' ἀπέδραν*, not an inappropriate expression for the hero's hardy mariners, once in Eur. Herakleid. 14, where it suits the pitiful case of Iolaos. But he cannot set up in defence his note on Sept. 794 where he says that *σποδεῖν* is a strong word of the vulgar vocabulary and accounts for *κατεσποδημένοι* there, 'because all the tragic passages < where *σποδεῖν* occurs > are put, like the present, in the mouth of a common person telling an exciting story'. Eteokles is not a common person and is not capable of 'scuttling', and the assumption of the decompound verb makes the reading still more audacious. In the same line is Dr. VERRALL's derivation of *ἀνακτος* Ag. 1210 from *ἀνάγω*, and perhaps it is this feat that prompted Mr. Bury (Preface to Isthmians) to derive *ἀναξифόρμιγγες* in the Pindaric *ἀναξифόρμιγγες ὕμνοι* from *ἀνάγω*, 'hymns that awaken the lyre', a fancy effectually disposed of by the *ἀναξι-* compounds in Bakchylides as *ἀναξίαλος* 20, 28, *ἀναξιβρόντας* 17, 12 and *ἀναξίμολπος* 6, 10. On the last cited passage Kenyon hesitates because 'Urania that awakens the song makes good sense', but what are we to do with *ὑμνοάνασσα* 12, 1? Jebb translates as from *ἄναξ* and takes no notice of Bury's suggestions. But why insist on what everybody will admit in theory that there are no worse enemies to criticism and exegesis than Puckish fancies and quaint translations? These be the frisky lizards that do so much harm to the denizens of the antique hive. Absint et picti squalentia terga lacerti. But as I write I recall my own sins. I recall my note on O. 2, 6 where I suggest *ὄπις* = *ὁ ὀπιζόμενος* which is quite in Dr. VERRALL's vein. I recall my *tunicatim*¹ for *tunicatum* (Pers. 4, 30) and the various characteristics Dr. FENNELL has seen fit to bestow on my exegesis of Pindar (A. J. P. XIV 501).

¹ ἄλλ' ὅμως. *Tunicatim* seems to be justified by Eupolis, fr. 255 (Kock): *ἐπιφαγεῖν μηδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ κρόμμινον λέποντα*.

One more note and I must leave this too fascinating subject. Of Jebb's sensitiveness every critic has much to say, but nothing could illuminate it with a stronger light than a casual footnote of VERRALL'S. 'He could not speak of Euripides, without pain in his voice, and seldom, without necessity, spoke of him at all. He had no strong desire, I think, to comprehend such a person'. Here lies the secret of Jebb's silence about those who had worked on the same lines and haply preceded him. I have touched on this before (A. J. P. XXVII 479). If it had been properly understood in his lifetime, it would have saved much bitter controversy about originality. Like the Greeks whom he knew so well and of whom it was said: *ὅτι περ ἂν Ἕλληνες βαρβάρων παραλάβωσι, κάλλιον τοῦτο εἰς τέλος ἀπεργάζονται*, Epinomis 987 E (Essays and Studies, p. 174), he transmuted everything he received from others and so made it his own. *Materiam superabat opus* and he might well spare himself 'the pain' of mentioning inferior scholars.

In his *Notes on Xenophon and Others* (London, S. Grant Richards) Mr. HERBERT RICHARDS has brought together his critical contributions to the *Classical Review* with certain additions, omissions and alterations so that the volume may be regarded as a better statement of his views on the passages discussed. Mr. RICHARDS'S *Notes* are not to be confounded with the genial guesswork in which so many of his countrymen indulge. They are based on a close and systematic study of the author with whom they are mainly concerned, and he does not disdain the patient assemblage of facts, lexical and syntactical, so that the Hellenist will find a number of observations to challenge his attention. Strong in grammar, Mr. RICHARDS does not hesitate to correct the slips of such a master as Jebb and to criticize his rendering of Ai. 186: *ἦκοι γὰρ ἂν θεία νόσος*, where *ἦκοι* is equivalent to a perfect optative. Grammar is the Athena of the classical scholar's Pantheon, and when the temptation comes to escape from a controversy on the swift chariot of rhetoric, if syntax, artful maid, is at his back, he may say with Diomed: *ἀκνείω δ' ἵππων ἐπιβαινέμεν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὼς | ἀντίον εἰμ' αὐτῶν· τρεῖν μ' οὐκ ἔα Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη*. Of course, a discussion of even a select few of Mr. RICHARDS'S emendations would be impossible in the space I reserve for myself in the Journal. True, Mr. RICHARDS invites corrections of the 'many statements about small matters of fact', but such corrections unless accompanied by a generous recognition of contributions of real merit might produce a false impression and my sins in that line are ever before me (A. J. P. XXVII 229). The syntactician will be interested in Mr. RICHARDS'S valuable discussion of the use of *ἄν* with the fut. inf. in Attic Greek, to which in its original form I have referred in my *Greek Syntax* (S. C. G. § 432), and the special student of Xenophon will weigh his conclusions as to the

genuineness of the disputed works. 'Xenophon's characteristic individual style', he says, 'is found in every one of the disputed writings, the *Respublica Atheniensium* excepted, and in every part of them all'. As to the *Cynegeticus*, which has attracted especial attention in American circles, he does not seem to be acquainted with Professor SANDERS' dissertation (Baltimore, 1903), in which it is maintained that 'a theory by which Xenophon as a young man compiled the *Cynegeticus* from other sources will satisfy the discrepancies between the upholders of the work as Xenophon's and those who consider it spurious', and he takes no notice of Cesareo's assault on the Symposium to which so many pages of the *Journal* were surrendered in a time of need (A. J. P. XXIII 446-457). 'It is a pity', he says, 'that the dialogue is not more generally known', and he adds 'a new commentary would be worth writing'. 'Generally known' means, of course, 'in England' for he says in his Preface: 'Xenophon is so little studied among us, except as easy Greek reading for beginners and to some extent for historical purposes, and the *Opera Minora* in particular are so unfamiliar that I fear few people will be interested in these discussions'. Whatever stretches of Greek literature the great English scholars have not parked possess scant attractions for their best men and those who have been brought up under other influences find it hard to suppress surprise at the aristocratic limits within which so many of them revolve. Of the *Praelections* delivered before the Society of the University of Cambridge last January, three of the five lectures had to do with Aischylos, one with Plato and the fifth while it began with Pindar led up to Plato. It is doubtless a fine thing to consort chiefly with these elect spirits, but this is not an age of exclusiveness. In spite of Jebb's example it is well for the student of the antique to understand such a person as Euripides, and while I share Niebuhr's prejudice against Xenophon, the man, I should no more shun the study of Xenophon, the author, than I should shun the study of American-English with which, according to Mr. Dakyns's unsupported statement, Xenophon's Greek has so much in common. It is rather interesting to note that Mr. MARCHANT, the editor of Xenophon in the Oxford *Bibliotheca*, should have been the man to open the door of English cubicles to the breeziness of Wilamowitz's Lesebuch.

The confirmation of a conjecture by the discovery of a new MS gives a thrill of joy to minds of a certain order. There are those who write letters to the Times about it. Old proofreaders are less ecstatic (A. J. P. XXIII 348). But those who have established an historical point by elaborate argumentation and find their results confirmed by new documents taste the *amari aliquid* that comes from the thought of labor wasted. The implied compliment to the investigator is much greater than the assurance of a happy 'restoration', but most conjectural critics are conscious after all

that they have been guessing and the reward comes like a prize in the lottery. So I venture to say that the late Dr. ADAM was much more pleased by a reading of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, which corroborated his correction, and mine of a much earlier date (A. J. P. XII 99), than Professor WRIGHT was at the confirmation of his admirable paper on the *Date of Cylon*, which reversed the teaching of all the histories up to that time; and I doubt whether the young scholar, Dr. GRIFFIN, who argued so stoutly in his *Dares and Dictys* (Baltimore) for the Greek original of Dictys Cretensis, read with unmixed joy the Greek fragment of Dictys, that came to light in the second volume of the *Tebtunis Papyri* just after the printing of his dissertation, the fruit of long and patient research. None of these things move the old stager, anticipation, nullification, nugification, and what the Germans call 'todtschweigen' and I, depersonalization. The main thing is that the new generation be not discouraged.

By reason of its bulk, its scope, its imposing array of proof-texts, its critical discussions, to say nothing of the high reputation of the veteran author, who long ago sharpened his syntactical tusks on that whetstone of grammarians, Thukydides, STAHL's *kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Heidelberg, Carl Winter), will at once challenge scrutiny at the hands of all specialists, and will doubtless be accepted by all Greek scholars as an indispensable work of reference. The book is not cumbered with citations of previous researches: and as grammarians are an irritable tribe, it is to be feared that STAHL's blanket acknowledgment of indebtedness to his predecessors—Wir alle sind Schuldner unserer Vorgänger—will not serve as an emollient plaster to the sensitive surface of some of those who have toiled for weary hours among the aridities of statistics and haply won here and there from the chaos of details the cosmos of ordered truth. The philosophical soul, however, will rejoice to see STAHL's day and calmly watch 'the dew drop slip into the shining sea', if a syntactical monograph can be called a 'dew drop' or a Greek syntax 'a shining sea'. In most cases 'morass' were a better word. This is but a preliminary notice to be followed in due time by a detailed review of the book with especial reference to the progress of doctrine in the last thirty years.

A. W. VAN B.: Add to the collection of passages in Professor Rolfe's article, Seasickness in Antiquity, A. J. P. XXVI (1904), 192 ff.; Sen. Dial. I 4, 12: praebendi fortunae sumus, ut contra illam ab ipsa duremur: paulatim nos sibi pares faciet, contemptum periculorum adsiduitas periclitandi dabit. *Sic sunt nauticis corpora ferendo mari dura*, agricolis manus tritae, ad excutienda tela militares lacerti ualent, agilia sunt membra cursoribus: id in quoque solidissimum est quod exercuit.

E. W. F.: Touching Professor Warren's derivation of Skr. *ukṣān-* 'taurus' from the root *vah-* 'ducere, trahere', A. J. P. XXVIII 255, it were well to note *anaḍ-vāh*, with a weak stem *anaḍ-ūh-*, 'onus-vehens' > 'taurus'; cf. also the feminine *anaḍuhī*. Other words of semantic interest in this connection are *vāhas* 'shoulder of an ox; a part of the yoke', *vahālās* and *vahin-* 'working in a yoke, yoked', *vahnīs* 'draught animal; team', *vāhās* and *vāhanam* 'horse, steer, animal'. There is no essential difference in semantic development between *ukṣān-* ['wagon-] puller' and (F)ῥος 'wagon.' As to the suffixation of *uxmentum*, Professor Warren does well perhaps to waste no words, further than to note, with an allusion to suffix adaptation, the synonyms *armentum* and *iumentum*. Possibly, however, *vahnīs* allows us to predicate a parallel *m*-formation, say *uḡh(s)Mā*, cf. the pair represented by Lat. *palma*, *παλάμη*, O. Ir. *lām*, in contrast with Skr. *pāṇīs*. That *uxor* also belongs to the root *weḡh-* seems to me most probable, though I can but think it contains *soror*, i. e. [*so*]*sor*, in composition, rather than that its flexional type only is due to *soror*. It seems a mere accident that Skr. *vāhas* did not fully develop the sense of 'yoke', which we possibly have in *uxor* if from *uḡh(s)*-[*swē*]*sor* 'yoke-sister', i. e. yokefellow, wife (cf. *coniux*).

Touching *velōd* (p. 269), I have been able to collect hardly any evidence, and all that debatable, for imperative or subjunctive forms in *-ōd*. But an injunctive **teget*, which might appear in Latin as *tege(d)* (cf. *feced* for *fecit* and *dede* for *dedit*) might, on the assumption that *-ōd* (from *-lōd*, by a false division) became 'productive', have yielded **tegōd*. This is just what happened in the Greek middle ending *-σθω*, and in Sanskrit the normal impv.-injunct. ending *-dhvam* appears in liturgical texts as *-dhvāt*, along with a string of *-tāt* forms (Whitney, *Gram*², § 571). The productivity of *-ōd* in Latin might be inferred from *sunt* : *sunt-ōd* : in a formal analogy, *vel* (2^d sg. impv.) : *velōd* :: **aget* (injunc. 3^d sg.) : *agetod* :: *sunt* : *suntod* :: *precamini* (2^d plur.) : *precamino(d)* (2^d and 3^d sg.). On the problem of the shift of person in *velod* from 2^d to 3^d, as well as its mood shift, it will be instructive to note Whitney, l. c. For the solution of the general problem of the intrusion of the impv. into dependent clauses see Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Classical Greek*, § 422.

I trust I may be pardoned for referring here to my explanation of the *-σθ*-forms of the Greek verb in *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, 29, 12. This explanation, which is, in my opinion, phonetically and pragmatically sound, has never, to the best of my knowledge, come to the notice of any of the Greek form grammarians.